



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

FITCH EVEN TABIN & FLANNERY
120 SOUTH LASALLE STREET
SUITE 1600
CHICAGO IL 60603-3406

COPY MAILED

DEC 08 2009

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Patent No. 7,530,303 :
Issued: May 12, 2009 :
Application No. 10/813,645 : PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT
Filed: March 30, 2004 :
Dkt. No.: 1410/67404 :

This is a decision on the "APPLICATION FOR PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.705(b)," filed March 27, 2009. This matter is being properly treated as an application for patent term adjustment pursuant to 37 CFR 1.705(d).

The application for patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.705(b) was filed March 27, 2009. However, prior to a decision on the merits of the application for patent term adjustment, the application matured into U.S. Pat. No. 7,530,303 on May 12, 2009. The patent issued with a patent term adjustment of 1,199 days.

Patentees request correction of the patent term adjustment from 1,199 days to 1,506 days. Patentees request this correction on the sole basis that the Office took in excess of three years to issue the above-referenced patent. Patentees reference *Wyeth v. Dudas*, Civil Action No. 07-1492, 580 F. Supp. 2d 138, 88 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1538 (D.D.C. Sept. 30, 2008) and assert that the patent is entitled to an adjustment of 1,506 days (1,199 days pursuant to 35 USC 154(b)(1)(A) *plus* 837 days pursuant to 35 USC 154(b)(1)(B) *less* 530 days of overlap). The request was predicated upon the presumption that the patent would issue July 14, 2009 when in fact the patent issued May 12, 2009.

The application for patent term adjustment (PTA) under 37 CFR 1.705(d) is **DISMISSED**.

Under 37 CFR 1.703(f), patentees are entitled to a period of patent term adjustment equal to the period of delays based on the grounds set forth in 37 CFR 1.702 reduced by the period of time equal to the period of time during which patentees failed to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude prosecution pursuant to 37 CFR 1.704. In other words, patentees are entitled to the period of Office delay reduced by the period of applicant delay.

The Office asserts that as of the issuance of the patent on May 12, 2009, the application was pending three years and 774 days after its filing date (March 31, 2007 to May 12, 2009). The Office asserts that certain action was not taken within the specified time frame, and thus, the application was pending 14 months and 1,199 days prior to the mailing of the non-final Office action on September 10, 2008. At issue is whether patentees should accrue 774 days of patent term adjustment for the Office taking in excess of three years to issue the patent, as well as 1,199

days for Office failure to take a certain action within a specified time frame (or examination delay).

The Office contends that the period of 774 days of delay in issuance of the patent under 37 CFR 1.702(b) overlaps with the period of 1,199 days of examination delay under 37 CFR 1.702(a). Patentees' calculation of the period of overlap is inconsistent with the Office's interpretation of this provision. 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) limits the adjustment of patent term, as follows:

To the extent that the periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in paragraph (1) overlap, the period of any adjustment granted under this subsection shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

As explained in *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f)*¹ and of the *United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, 69 Fed. Reg. 34283 (June 21, 2004), the Office interprets 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) as permitting either patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv), or patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), but not as permitting patent term adjustment under both 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv) and 154(b)(1)(B). Accordingly, the Office implements the overlap provision as follows:

If an application is entitled to an adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the period of delay under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay overlap under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A). Thus, any days of delay for Office issuance of the patent more than 3 years after the filing date of the application, which overlap with the days of patent term adjustment accorded prior to the issuance of the patent will not result in any additional patent term adjustment. See 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A), and 37 CFR § 1.703(f). See *Changes to Implement Patent Term Adjustment Under Twenty Year Term; Final Rule*, 65 Fed. Reg. 54366 (Sept. 18, 2000). See also *Revision of Patent Term Extension and Patent Term Adjustment Provisions; Final Rule*, 69 Fed. Reg. 21704 (April 22, 2004), 1282 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 100 (May 18, 2004).

Further, as stated in the *Explanation of 37 CFR 1.703(f)* and of the *United States Patent and Trademark Office Interpretation of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A)*, the Office has consistently taken the position that if an application is entitled to an adjustment under the three-year pendency provision of 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B), the entire period during which the application was pending

¹ Likewise, 37 CFR 1.703(f) provides that:

To the extent that periods of delay attributable to the grounds specified in §1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted under this section shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

before the Office (except for periods excluded under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iii)), and not just the period beginning three years after the actual filing date of the application, is the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay “overlap” under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A).

This interpretation is consistent with the statute. Taken together the statute and rule provide that to the extent that periods of delay attributable to grounds specified in 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1) and in corresponding §1.702 overlap, the period of adjustment granted shall not exceed the actual number of days the issuance of the patent was delayed.

In this instance, the relevant period under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) in determining whether periods of delay “overlap” under 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(2)(A) is the period during which the application was pending before the Office beginning on the application filing date under 35 U.S.C. 111(a), March 30, 2004, and ending on the date that the patent issued, May 12, 2009.

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(A) and 37 CFR 1.702(a)(1), the application was pending 14 months and 1,199 days prior to the issuance of the non-final Office action on September 10, 2008. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(1)(B) and 37 CFR 1.702(b), the application was pending three years and 774 days prior to the issuance of the patent on May 12, 2009.

The 774 days of delay in issuance of the patent under 37 CFR 1.702(b) overlap with the 1,199 days of patent term adjustment under 37 CFR 1.702(a). Entry of both the 774 days and the 1,199 days is neither permitted nor warranted given that 1,199 days is the actual number of days issuance of the patent was delayed.

Accordingly, at issuance, having considered the 774 days of Office delay under the three-year pendency provision in conjunction with the 1,199 days of examination delay, the Office properly entered 702 days of patent term adjustment.

In view thereof, no adjustment to the patent term will be made.

No additional fees are due in connection with this matter.

Telephone inquiries specific to this matter should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3205.



Alesia M. Brown
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions